Path Forward
200-SW-1/2 RI/FS Work Plan Development
May 15, 2007

To help assure that the product to be delivered to Ecology in late September 2007 is acceptable to all parties, this document is drafted and agreed to by representatives of DOE-RL and Ecology. A Collaborative Agreement on this Work Plan was developed and signed by these two parties in March 2005. Both parties and Fluor Hanford have been engaged in collaborative discussions since August 2006 to develop a good understanding of the Party's needs for the DQO for this set of TSD landfills and past practice landfills. Many hours have been spent in the DQO meetings, and we have a good understanding of what is necessary to move forward.

Fluor Hanford is contractually responsible to prepare the RI/FS Work Plan (Draft B), and support DOE-RL's delivery of this product to Ecology by September 30, 2007. Due to complexity in scope and issues associated with these landfills, the Work Plan and RI/FS will be structured in a manner that incorporates a phased approach. The phased approach will be aimed at reaching early agreement on the next stage of field characterization activity. This phased approach is expected to require future revisions to the Work Plan and/or Sampling and Analysis Plan after substantive portions of the next phase(s) of remedial investigation is/are completed.

The decision strategy to be used in this RI/FS Work Plan will center on collecting data and information to evaluate remedial alternatives that will be considered in the feasibility study (FS), including:

- Excavation, treatment (as necessary) and disposal of waste from within individual burial grounds
- Excavation, treatment (as necessary) and disposal of waste from selected sections of individual burial grounds
- Capping of individual burial grounds
- In-situ treatment (e.g., vitrification or grouting) of portions of individual burial grounds
- Some combination of the above
- No action with continued monitoring

Because a good estimate exists for the total length/volume of the landfill trenches, the excavation estimate will be most sensitive to the extent of safety measures that must be implemented while excavating potentially dangerous waste (e.g., carbon tetrachloride), characterizing and/or assessing and routing waste to appropriate disposal facilities, the cost of treatment (as necessary), and the cost of disposal. Most information to estimate these elements of the RTD remedy can be acquired from similar operations being conducted at Hanford and elsewhere. However, it is recognized that additional work is needed for costing the possible disposition activities associated with large, contaminated equipment and waste containers.

The most challenging objective for characterization activities conducted under the work plan will be evaluation of a response scenario in which targeted items within a given landfill are excavated (and perhaps treated) prior to construction of the selected remedy.

A key assumption is that targeting limited waste items/areas for potential excavation will center on determining whether a current or future threat to groundwater, human health or environment exists.

Phase I-A characterization has already been conducted; it consisted of non-intrusive surface radiation surveys, surface geophysics and soil gas surveys. Phase I-B will consist of the use of primarily non-intrusive geophysical and soil gas characterization activities to target areas that may contain either organic vapors or buried masses of metal that may contain liquid organics or areas that contain both. Phase II activities will consist of focused, intrusive investigations of the targets resulting from Phases I-A and 1-B which may suggest the potential for DNAPL sources, or other items of interest.

It is assumed that additional characterization beyond Phase II will be required (i.e. Phase III), stemming from the information and data as well as the results of modeling that will evaluate the human health and ecological risk and migration to groundwater following the CERCLA RI/FS process. Scope within Phase III may also be needed to address areas that require particular caution due to worker safety concerns (e.g., burial grounds containing elevated levels of plutonium).

In order to fill data needs in an efficient manner, early elements of the baseline risk assessment and feasibility study will be undertaken in parallel with characterization phases II and III in an effort to use feedback between the investigation and the risk and alternatives evaluation process.

DOE-RL Representative

5/22/07

Ecology Representative

Cook, Sylvia V

From: Roddy, Francis M
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 7:47 AM
To: Cook, Sylvia V
Cc: Berlin, Gregory T
Subject: FW: SW-2 Agreement -- Phased Approach

Attachments: SW2pathforward - phased characterization.pdf

Please put this document in the Administrative Record.

Thanks.

Frank Roddy

From: Berlin, Gregory T
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 7:36 AM
To: Cook, Sylvia V; Roddy, Francis M
Cc: Berlin, Gregory T
Subject: FW: SW-2 Agreement -- Phased Approach

Frank -- If OK with you, could you please forward this note to Sylvia Cook and state that you concur with entering the attached Agreement into the Admin Record. This Agreement is getting entered into the AR (embodied in UMM and PMM meeting minutes), but I'd like to have a cleaner way of referencing/citing this 3-pager as a standalone document rather then hidden within 50 pages of other "stuff." Therefore, with your OK, Sylivia can make this happen. Please call me if you have questions.

Sylvia -- If you get an OK from Frank and get it entered, can you please let me know of the accession number or best way to locate the document.

Thanks,

Greg

From: Berlin, Gregory T
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2007 9:12 PM
To: Berlin, Gregory T
Subject: SW-2 Agreement -- Phased Approach

SW2pathforward - phased charac...